

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Annual Research & Review in Biology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ARRB_128379 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Optimizing breadfruit processing for nutritional, phytochemical and antioxidant properties: enhancing food security in Nigeria. |
| Type of the Article | |

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|--|---|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | I have now looked at the paper. The abstract, key words are OK. The paper is relevant to the theme of the journal and will contribute to academic debate. The paper is well structured and the APPROACH used for the study are sound. In my opinion, the subject matter of research problem is highly appreciable. It will surely make a contribution to the relevant field of research. The presentation of thoughts in the paper is notable. The paper should be published with minimum revision. | Noted |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title of the article is suitable (adequate) | OK |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract of the article is comprehensive (adequate) | Noted |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript is scientifically correct (adequate). | Ok |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The references are sufficient and fairly recent. | Thanks |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications (adequate) | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|--|--|--|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |